UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,262	02/20/2004	Kenneth McKethan	014682.000003	2261

44870 7590 09/12/2007

MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC For IBM
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER	
YIGDALL, MICHAEL J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2192	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
09/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,262	MCKETHAN, KENNETH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J. Yigdall	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 July 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21-27 and 29-46* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21-27 and 29-46* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to Applicant's submission filed on July 6, 2007. Claims 1-19, 21-27 and 29-46 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. The rejection of claims 11-14, 16, 18-27, 29 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. 101, as set forth in the Office action mailed on April 10, 2007, has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's contention that claims 36-46, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter (remarks, page 11), the examiner respectfully notes that the new language "encoded with" does not serve to exclude the non-statutory embodiments of a "computer-readable medium" described in Applicant's specification. Thus, the claims are still not limited to statutory subject matter. See the rejection below.

Applicant contends that Deziel does not teach or suggest determining an estimated project churn wherein project churn includes any identifiable and unplanned changes to a scope of the project (remarks, pages 11-12).

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Deziel teaches determining an expected or estimated delay to account for any shortfalls that may affect the project (see, for example, column 15, lines 63-68). A reasonable interpretation of the language recited in the claims reads on these teachings. The term "project churn" is abstract, and the description of shortfall in

Deziel is within the realm of "any identifiable and unplanned changes to a scope of the project" (see, for example, column 15, lines 44-58).

In response to Applicant's statements that Deziel does not teach or suggest features recited in dependent claims 2, 7 and 8 (remarks, pages 12-13), the examiner notes that Applicant does not provide any explanation or reasoning to support these statements. General allegations of patentability do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b). The examiner respectfully submits that a reasonable interpretation of the language recited in the claims reads on the teachings of Deziel as set forth in the Office action.

Applicant contends that there is no teaching or suggestion in Deziel of tracking reworked tasks and time duration to complete each reworked task during the course of the project (remarks, page 13).

Nonetheless, Applicant's characterization of Deziel is that the project network is scheduled and available for review and utilization by the user for managing a project and allocating tasks and resources according to the scheduled project (remarks, page 13). Indeed, Deziel also discloses that the user "may view a time line of resource usage relative to the activities in the project network or can view a calendar of scheduled activities" (column 19, lines 25-28). Thus, Deziel teaches tracking tasks and durations over the course of the project.

Applicant contends that Deziel only teaches a confidence level used to predict finish times of the activities and project which is specified by the user and does not teach or suggest entering a weight factor for each of the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements to perform a weighted average duration analysis (remarks, page 14).

However, the confidence level is a weight factor. As set forth in the Office action, Deziel teaches entering the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements (see, for example, column 8, lines 2-4), and further teaches entering the confidence level (i.e., the weight factor) for those time requirements (see, for example, column 8, lines 5-7).

Applicant further contends that Deziel does not teach or suggest performing a weighted average duration analysis on any task requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (remarks, page 14).

Again, the examiner respectfully notes that general allegations of patentability do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b). However, as set forth in the Office action, Deziel teaches performing a weighted average duration analysis on each task in terms of performing the calculation $N^{-1}(\% \mid t_j^{\mu}, t_j^{v})$ for each task to estimate the duration of the project (see, for example, column 8, lines 24-26). The "%" represents the confidence level (see, for example, column 7, lines 48-52), or in other words, the weight factor. The calculation finds an inverse cumulative normal distribution (see, for example, column 6, lines 5-7) based on the expected duration t_j^{μ} and variance t_j^{v} of each activity j (see, for example, column 5, lines 26-31) and the weight factor. Thus, Deziel teaches performing a weighted average duration analysis on each task.

Applicant contends that Deziel does not teach or suggest an analysis program that uses heuristic information to determine an impact to the project nor does Deziel teach or suggest that the analysis program utilizes a weighting factor for each of the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements to determining the impact to the project (remarks, page 15).

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Deziel teaches a weighting factor as noted above. Furthermore, as set forth in the Office action, Deziel teaches collecting heuristic information at least in terms of collecting precedence information and the parameters of a probability distribution on the duration of each task (see, for example, column 7, lines 58-67). The language recited in the claims implies that the "heuristic information" comprises the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements. Indeed, in Deziel, the parameters of the probability distribution include the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements (see, for example, column 8, lines 2-4).

In response to Applicant's other arguments (remarks, page 15-16), the examiner refers to the explanations presented above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 36-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With respect to claim 36 (currently amended), the claim is directed to a "computer-readable medium encoded with computer-executable instructions for performing a method." However, the claimed subject matter is not limited to statutory embodiments. Applicant's definition of "computer-readable medium" includes, for example, a "stream of information" (specification, page 14, paragraph [0024]), and "paper or another suitable medium upon which

the program may be printed" (page 15, paragraph [0024]). In such cases the claimed subject matter amounts to descriptive material *per se*, which is non-statutory subject matter. See MPEP § 2106.01. Streams of information and paper encoded with computer-executable instructions do not define any structural and functional interrelationships that would enable the functionality of the instructions to be realized. Note that signals and carrier waves, such as those that may "communicate or transport the program" (page 14, paragraph [0024]), do not fall within any category of statutory subject matter. See *Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility* (1300 OG 142). Even signals and carrier waves encoded with computer-executable instructions do not fall within any category of statutory subject matter. Accordingly, absent a clear disavowal of any non-statutory embodiments described in Applicant's specification, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter. Dependent claims 37-46 (currently amended) do not remedy claim 36.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-12, 14-19, 21-26 and 29-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,406,476 to Deziel, Jr. et al. (art of record, "Deziel").

With respect to claim 1 (currently amended), Deziel teaches a method to gauge and control churn of a project (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

determining an estimated project churn, wherein project churn includes any identifiable and unplanned changes to a scope of the project (see, for example, column 15, lines 63-68, which shows determining an estimated delay in the project to account for shortfalls, and column 15, lines 44-58, which further shows that shortfall is included among any identifiable and unplanned changes to a scope of the project); and

allocating resources in response to the estimated project churn (see, for example, column 18, lines 64-68, which shows allocating resources in response to the estimate).

With respect to claim 2 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches that determining the estimated project churn comprises collecting heuristic information on each task of the project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 7, lines 58-67, which shows collecting heuristic information for every such activity or task of the project).

With respect to claim 3 (original), the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches entering at least optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements to rework or modify each task of the project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 8, lines 2-4, which shows entering optimistic, pessimistic and most likely times for every such activity or task).

With respect to claim 4 (original), the method of claim 2 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches performing a weighted average duration analysis for each task of the project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example,

column 8, lines 24-26, which shows performing a weighted average duration analysis for every such activity or task).

With respect to claim 5 (original), the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches determining an average time requirement to rework or modify each task of the project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 8, lines 24-26, which shows determining average times for every such activity or task).

With respect to claim 6 (original), the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches determining the average time requirement comprises averaging at least an optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirement to rework or modify each task of the project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 12, lines 52-66, which shows averaging optimistic, pessimistic and most likely times for every such activity or task).

With respect to claim 7 (original), the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches entering a weight factor for each optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirement (see, for example, column 8, lines 5-7, which shows entering a confidence weight factor for the times).

With respect to claim 8 (original), the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches performing a weighted average duration analysis on the average time requirement for each task of the project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project

changes (see, for example, column 8, lines 24-26, which shows performing a weighted average duration analysis for every such activity or task).

With respect to claim 9 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches determining an impact to the project in response to the weighted average duration analysis (see, for example, column 16, lines 3-16, which shows determining an impact to the project in response to the analysis).

With respect to claim 10 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches tracking reworked tasks and time duration to complete each reworked task during the course of the project (see, for example, column 19, lines 19-28, which shows tracking activities or tasks during the course of the project).

With respect to claim 11 (currently amended), Deziel teaches a method to gauge and control churn of a project (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

entering a project-specific task list (see, for example, column 7, lines 58-67, which shows entering an activity or task list for a project);

entering at least optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements to rework or modify each task of the project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 8, lines 2-4, which shows entering optimistic, pessimistic and most likely times for every such activity or task);

entering a weighting factor for each of the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements to perform a weighted average duration analysis (see, for example, column 8, lines 5-7, which shows entering a confidence weighting factor for the times);

determining an average time requirement to rework or modify each task requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 8, lines 24-26, which shows determining average times for every such activity or task);

performing a weighted average duration analysis on any tasks requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 8, lines 24-26, which shows performing a weighted average duration analysis for every such activity or task);

determining an impact to the project in response to the weighted average duration analysis (see, for example, column 16, lines 3-16, which shows determining an impact to the project in response to the analysis); and

presenting the impact to a user (see, for example, column 19, lines 19-28, which shows presenting the impact).

With respect to claim 12 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches collecting heuristic information on each task of the project to determine the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirement to rework or modify each task of the project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 7, lines 58-67, which shows collecting heuristic information for every such activity or task of the project).

With respect to claim 14 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches that determining the impact to the project comprises totaling times for all affected

tasks from the weighted average duration analysis (see, for example, column 12, lines 25-33, which shows totaling the duration of every such activity or task).

With respect to claim 15 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches allocating resources in response to the impact to the project (see, for example, column 18, lines 64-68, which shows allocating resources in response to the impact).

With respect to claim 16 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches tracking reworked tasks and time duration to complete each reworked task during the course of the project (see, for example, column 19, lines 19-28, which shows tracking activities or tasks during the course of the project).

With respect to claim 17 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches presenting the impact to the project to provide an early warning (see, for example, column 19, lines 19-28, which shows presenting the impact).

With respect to claim 18 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches that entering the project-specific tasks comprises generating a graphical user interface for a user to enter the tasks (see, for example, column 8, lines 14-19, which shows generating such a graphical user interface).

With respect to claim 19 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches that entering the at least optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements comprises generating a graphical user interface for a user to enter the time requirements (see, for example, column 8, lines 14-19, which shows generating such a graphical user interface).

With respect to claim 21 (currently amended), Deziel teaches a system to gauge and control churn of a project (see, for example, the abstract), comprising:

an input device to enter heuristic information on each task of a project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 7, lines 58-67, which shows entering heuristic information for every such activity or task of a project);

a processor (see, for example, CPU 10 in FIG. 1); and

an analysis program operable on the processor to determine an impact to the project in response to any potential project changes using the heuristic information, wherein the analysis program is adapted to utilize an optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements for each task of the project and a weighting factor for each of the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements to determine the impact to the project (see, for example, column 16, lines 3-16, which shows determining an impact to the project using the information, and column 8, lines 2-4 and 5-7, which shows further shows that the analysis uses optimistic, pessimistic and most likely times for every such activity or task and a confidence weighting factor for the times); and

an output device to present the impact to a user (see, for example, column 19, lines 19-28, which shows presenting the impact).

With respect to claim 22 (original), the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches a display to present graphical user interfaces for entering the heuristic information and other information (see, for example, column 8, lines 14-19, which shows such graphical user interfaces).

With respect to claim 23 (original), the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches a user interface generator to generate a graphical user interface displayable to a user on the display to enter a project-specific task list (see, for example, column 7, lines 58-67, which shows entering an activity or task list for the project).

With respect to claim 24 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches a user interface generator to generate a graphical user interface displayable to a user to enter at least the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements to rework or modify each task of a project requiring rework or modification in response to any potential project changes (see, for example, column 8, lines 2-4, which shows entering optimistic, pessimistic and most likely times for every such activity or task).

With respect to claim 25 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches that the user interface generator is adapted to generate a graphical user interface to enter the weighting factor for each of the optimistic, pessimistic and expected time requirements to perform a weighted average duration analysis (see, for example, column 8, lines 5-7, which shows entering a confidence weighting factor for the times, and column 8, lines 24-26, which shows performing a weighted average duration analysis).

With respect to claim 26 (original), the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches that the analysis program comprises a weighted average duration analysis program (see, for example, column 8, lines 24-26, which shows performing a weighted average duration analysis).

With respect to claim 29 (original), the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches means to track reworked tasks and time duration to complete each reworked task during the course of the project (see, for example, column 19, lines 19-28, which shows tracking activities or tasks during the course of the project).

With respect to claim 30 (original), the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches means to allocate resources in response to the impact to the project (see, for example, column 18, lines 64-68, which shows allocating resources in response to the impact).

With respect to claim 31 (currently amended), the claim is directed to a method of making a system that corresponds to the system of claim 21 (see the rejection of claim 21 above).

With respect to claim 32 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 22 (see the rejection of claim 22 above).

With respect to claim 33 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claims 23-25 (see the rejection of claims 23-25 above).

With respect to claim 34 (original), the rejection of 31 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 26 (see the rejection of claim 26 above).

With respect to claim 35 (original), the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 28 (see the rejection of claim 28 above).

With respect to claim 36 (currently amended), the claim is directed to a computer-readable medium encoded with computer-executable instructions for performing a method that corresponds to the method of claim 1 (see the rejection of claim 1 above).

With respect to claim 37 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 36 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 2 (see the rejection of claim 2 above).

With respect to claim 38 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 37 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 3 (see the rejection of claim 3 above).

With respect to claim 39 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 37 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 4 (see the rejection of claim 4 above).

With respect to claim 40 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 37 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 5 (see the rejection of claim 5 above).

With respect to claim 41 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 37 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 6 (see the rejection of claim 6 above).

With respect to claim 42 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 41 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 7 (see the rejection of claim 7 above).

With respect to claim 43 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 8 (see the rejection of claim 8 above).

With respect to claim 44 (currently amended), the rejection of claim 36 is incorporated, and Deziel further teaches generating a graphical user interface for a user to enter a project-specific task list (see, for example, column 7, lines 58-67, which shows entering an activity or task list for the project).

With respect to claim 45 (currently amended), the rejection of 36 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 3 (see the rejection of claim 3 above).

With respect to claim 46 (currently amended), the rejection of 45 is incorporated, and the elements recited in the claim correspond to those of claim 7 (see the rejection of claim 7 above).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deziel, as applied to claims 11 and 26 above, respectively, in view of 5,826,236 to Narimatsu et al. (art of record, "Narimatsu").

With respect to claim 13 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated. Deziel does not expressly disclose that performing the weighted average duration analysis comprises performing a program evaluation and review technique (PERT).

However, in an analogous art, Narimatsu teaches performing a PERT calculation (see, for example, column 16, lines 44-56), so as to reduce scheduling time when allocating resources to processes or tasks (see, for example, column 10, lines 20-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method of Deziel such that performing the weighted average duration analysis comprises performing a program evaluation and review technique (PERT), as Narimatsu suggests, so as to reduce scheduling time when allocating resources to the activities or tasks.

With respect to claim 27 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Deziel does not expressly disclose that the analysis program comprises a programmed evaluation and review technique (PERT).

However, in an analogous art, Narimatsu teaches performing a PERT calculation (see, for example, column 16, lines 44-56), so as to reduce scheduling time when allocating resources to processes or tasks (see, for example, column 10, lines 20-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system of Deziel such that the analysis program comprises a programmed evaluation and review technique (PERT), as Narimatsu suggests, so as to reduce scheduling time when allocating resources to the activities or tasks.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated any new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Yigdall whose telephone number is (571) 272-3707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MY

Michael J. Yigdall
Examiner
Art Unit 2192

mjy

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER